UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,215	03/30/2001	Judith A. Goldstein	42390P10854	6074

8791 7590 03/09/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER	
COFFY, EMMANUEL	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/823,215	GOLDSTEIN, JUDITH A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Emmanuel Coffy	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 March 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *2,5,6,14,19,23,24, 27* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *30* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 1st, 2006 has been entered.

Claims 1-30 represent a "Method and Apparatus for Intersystem Cut/Copy and Paste." Claims 1, 3, 12, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, 26 and 28 were amended. Claims 2, 5, 6, 14, 19, 23, 24 and 27 are canceled. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. On March 1st, 2006, Applicant filed amendments and arguments requesting reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections. Said arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant did endeavor to "clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made" as required by 37 CFR § 1.111(c). However, the amendments do not avoid such references nor are the arguments persuasive as earlier stated. Furthermore, the arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections.

3. The dependent and non-amended claims stand rejected as articulated in the last Office Action and all objections not addressed in Applicant's response are herein

reiterated. Applicant is advised that only the significant amendments are herein addressed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1,4, 7, 8 and 12 directed to an apparatus and a method are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen et al. (US 6,484,207) in view of Crutcher (US 5,964,834.)

Petersen teaches a network data switch which includes a memory buffer to which information is copied from a computing system selected via the network data switch from two or more network devices coupled with the network data switch as a result of a first substantially predetermined event. (See abstract).

Claim 1:

Referring to claim 1, Petersen substantially teaches an apparatus comprising:

a switch-box, wherein the switch-box comprises a control, the control to copy information to a network cut-and-paste data-structure from a computing system selected via the switch-box from two or more computing systems coupled with the switch-box as a result of the control recognizing a first predetermined event. (See Fig.1 and col. 5, lines 23-25, **see also Fig. 4, storage control (412), retrieval control (438), buffer 3 (430.)**)

Petersen is silent as to "wherein the first computing system comprises a standard cut-and-copy buffer, wherein the execution of the first dedicated predetermined event causes the information to be associated with a user-id and to be copied to the network cut-and-paste data-structure and not to the standard cut-and-copy buffer of the first computing system, and wherein the information associated with the user-id is copied from the network cut-and-paste data-structure to a second computing system of the two or more computing systems as a result of the control recognizing the execution of the second dedicated predetermined event."

However, Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 6-col. 8, line 65 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (a user input is interpreted as a first dedicated predetermined event. See Fig. 5(152); clipboard (110) is both the switch box which is external to the first computing system. See Fig. 4; as for the user-id see col. 7, lines 23-27 : "the source port number" is interpreted as the user-id; as for the second predetermined event see col. 8, lines 35-43: "the user defines a group" is interpreted as the second predetermined event; as for the control recognizing the execution of the second dedicated predetermined event see col. 8, lines 50-65: "monitoring the UDP port" is interpreted as the control.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the switching system taught by Petersen with the method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors

disclosed by Crutcher because such system would automatically share data among clipboards of multiple workstations, without the time consuming user operations.

Claim 4:

Referring to claim 4, Petersen teaches the apparatus of claim 3 further comprising a timer employed, at least in part, to recognize the first and second keystroke sequences.

A clock and timer are inherent parts of a computer; therefore, claim 4 is rejected.

Claim 7:

Referring to claim 7, Petersen teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the two or more computing systems are coupled with the switch-box via a data transfer coupling (See Fig. 1 (110)) and a set of interface device couplings. (See Fig. 1 (118)).

Claim 8:

Referring to claim 8, Petersen teaches the apparatus of claim 7, wherein the data transfer coupling comprises a parallel interface. (See col. 1, lines 48-50).

Claim 12:

Petersen substantially teaches a method comprising:

copying information from one of at least two or more computing systems a network cut-and-paste data-structure, a switch-box being accessible by the two or more computing systems, the copying occurring as a result of a control in the switch-box recognizing a predetermined event, (See Fig.1 and col. 5, lines 23-25, **see also Fig. 4, storage control (412), retrieval control (438), buffer 3 (430.)**)

Petersen is silent about "wherein the first computing system comprises a

standard cut-and-copy buffer, wherein the execution of the first dedicated predetermined event causes the information to be associated with a user-id and to be copied to network cut-and-paste data-structure and not to the standard cut-and-copy buffer of the first computing system; and

"copying the information associated with the user-id in the network cut-and-paste data-structure to a second computing system of the two or more computing systems as a result of the control recognizing the execution of the second dedicated predetermined event."

However, Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 6-col. 8, line 65 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (a user input is interpreted as a first dedicated predetermined event. See Fig. 5(152); clipboard (110) is both the switch box and network cut-and-paste data-structure. See Fig. 4; as for the user-id see col. 7, lines 23-27 : "the source port number" is interpreted as the user-id; as for the second predetermined event see col. 8, lines 35-43: "the user defines a group" is interpreted as the second predetermined event; as for the control recognizing the execution of the second dedicated predetermined event see col. 8, lines 50-65: "monitoring the UDP port" is interpreted as the control.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the switching system taught by Petersen with the method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors

disclosed by Crutcher because such system would automatically share data among clipboards of multiple workstations, without the time consuming user operations.

6. Claims 3, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen et al. (US '207) in view of Crutcher (US '834) in further view of D'Arlach et al. (US 6,026,433.)

Claim 3:

Referring to claim 3, it recites the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the first and second substantially predetermined events are substantially predetermined respective first and second keystroke sequences.

Peterson and Crutcher teach first and second substantially predetermined events. Peterson is silent about keystroke sequences as the respective first and second events.

However, D'Arlach teaches a method of editing a web site in a client-server environment. (See col. 5, lines 26-27 and lines 52-55). (A user first selects a template by using a keyboard and then the user submits changes again by using the keyboard.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the predetermined events taught by Petersen with editing a web site in a network environment as disclosed by D'Arlach. Such a system would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely.

Claim 13:

Referring to claim 13, it recites the method of claim 12, wherein copying

information to the network cut-and-paste data-structure is accomplished by employing the standard cut-and-paste buffer of the one of at least two or more computing systems.

Peterson fails to suggest employing a standard cut-and-paste buffer of the one of at least two or more computing systems. Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 38-61 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (a user input is interpreted as a first dedicated predetermined event. See Fig. 5(152); clipboard (110) is both the switch box and the network cut-and-paste data-structure. See Fig. 4.) However, D'Arlach specifically teaches this limitation at col. 6, lines 21-43.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching system taught by Petersen with the system disclosed by D'Arlach. Such a system would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely.

Claim 15:

Referring to claim 15, it recites the method of claim 12, wherein the first and second substantially predetermined events comprise substantially predetermined, substantially time-limited respective first and second keystroke sequences.

Peterson teaches first and second substantially predetermined events. Neither Peterson nor Crutcher teaches about keystroke sequences as the respective first and second events.

However, D'Arlach teaches a method of editing a web site in a client-server environment. (See col. 5, lines 26-27 and lines 52-55). (A user first selects a template

by using a keyboard and then the user submits changes again by using the keyboard.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the predetermined events taught by Petersen with editing a web site in a network environment as disclosed by D'Arlach. Such a system would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely.

7. Claims 16-18, 20-22, 25-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen et al. (U.S. 6,484,207) in view of Crutcher (US 5,964,834) in further view of D'Arlach et al. (US 6,026,433.)

Claim 16:

Referring to claims 16, Peterson substantially teaches the method of claim 15 as discussed sbove. Petersen is silent about "wherein the first and second keystroke sequences are keystroke sequences defined by respective operating systems of the one of the more computing systems and the another computing system of the two or more computing systems for accessing standard cut-and-paste buffers employed by those systems."

However, Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 38-61 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (a user input is interpreted as a first dedicated predetermined event. See Fig. 5(152); clipboard (110) is both the switch box and the memory buffer which is external to the first computing system. See Fig. 4.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the switching system taught by Petersen with the

method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors disclosed by Crutcher because such system would automatically share data among clipboards of multiple workstations, without the time consuming user operations.

Neither Peterson nor Crutcher specifically addresses the keystroke sequences as the respective first and second events.

However, D'Arlach teaches a method of editing a web site in a client-server environment. (See col. 5, lines 26-27 and lines 52-55). (A user first selects a template by using a keyboard and then the user submits changes again by using the keyboard.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the predetermined events taught by Petersen and the method and system for sharing data in a computer network taught by Crutcher with editing a web site in a network environment as disclosed by D'Arlach. Such a system would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely.

Claim 17

Peterson substantially teaches the method of claim 12 as discussed above.

Petersen is silent about "wherein the first and second keystroke sequences are substantially dedicated keystroke sequences for copying information to and from the external buffer."

However, Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 38-61 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (a user input is interpreted as a first dedicated predetermined event. See Fig. 5(152); clipboard (110) is both the switch box and the

memory buffer which is external to the first computing system. See Fig. 4.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the switching system taught by Petersen with the method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors disclosed by Crutcher because such system would automatically share data among clipboards of multiple workstations, without the time consuming user operations.

Neither Peterson nor Crutcher specifically addresses the keystroke sequences as the respective first and second events.

However, D'Arlach teaches a method of editing a web site in a client-server environment. (See col. 5, lines 26-27 and lines 52-55). (A user first selects a template by using a keyboard and then the user submits changes again by using the keyboard corresponding to the first and second keystroke sequences as substantially dedicated keystroke sequences.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the predetermined events taught by Petersen and the method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors disclosed by Crutcher with editing a web site in a network environment as disclosed by D'Arlach. Such a system would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely.

Claim 18:

Petersen substantially teaches a method comprising:

determining by a control in a switch-box that a first dedicated predetermined event has been generated by a user at a first computing system, wherein the user has

an associated user-id and wherein the first computing system comprises a standard cut-and-copy buffer;

copying information from the first computing system to a network cut-and-paste data-structure as a result of the first dedicated predetermined event; wherein the first dedicated predetermined event is an indication to copy the information to the network cut-and-paste data-structure and not to the standard cut-and-copy buffer of the first computing system. Petersen prominently teaches a memory buffer in conjunction with a switch-box. (See Fig.1 and col. 5, lines 14-25, see also Fig. 4, storage control (412), retrieval control (438), buffer 3 (430.))

Petersen does not specifically teach a first computing system comprising a standard cut-and-copy buffer; determining by the control that a second dedicated predetermined event has been generated by the user at a second computing system; and searching the network cut-and-paste data structure as a result of the second dedicated predetermined event, wherein the execution of the second dedicated predetermined event causes the information with the associated user-id to be copied from the network cut-and-paste data-structure to the second computing system.

However, Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 6-col. 8, line 65 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (a user input is interpreted as a first dedicated predetermined event. See Fig. 5(152); clipboard (110) is both the switch box and network cut-and-paste data-structure, which is external to the first computing system. See Fig. 4; as for the user-id see col. 7, lines 23-27: "the source port number" is

interpreted as the user-id; as for the second predetermined event see col. 8, lines 35-43: "the user defines a group" is interpreted as the second predetermined event; as for the control recognizing the execution of the second dedicated predetermined event see col. 8, lines 50-65: "monitoring the UDP port" is interpreted as the control.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the switching system taught by Petersen with the method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors disclosed by Crutcher because such system would automatically share data among clipboards of multiple workstations, without the time consuming user operations.

Neither Petersen nor Crutcher discloses associating the copied information with the associated user-id in the network cut-and-paste data-structure. However, D'Arlach teaches such limitations. (See col. 3, line 64 to col. 5, line 5.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching system taught by Petersen and the system taught by Crutcher with the copying system disclosed by D'Arlach because it would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely by providing access to the Internet.

Claim 20:

Referring to claim 20, both Petersen and Crutcher are silent about the method of claim 18. However, D'Arlach teaches wherein determining that the network copy request was generated comprises recognizing a first substantially predetermined, substantially time-limited event. (See col. 11, lines 36-37). Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the

switching system taught by Petersen and the system taught by Crutcher with the copying system disclosed by D'Arlach because it would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely by providing access to the Internet

Claim 21:

Referring to claim 21, both Petersen and Crutcher are silent about the method of claim 20. However, D'Arlach teaches wherein determining that the network paste request has been generated comprises recognizing a second substantially predetermined, substantially time-limited event. (See col. 5, lines 52-54). Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching system taught by Petersen and the system taught by Crutcher with the copying system disclosed by D'Arlach because it would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely by providing access to the Internet

Claim 22:

Referring to claim 22, both Petersen and Crutcher are silent about the method of claim 21. However, D'Arlach teaches wherein the first and second substantially predetermined, substantially time-limited events comprise respective first and second keystroke sequences. (See col. 5, lines 26-27 and lines 52-55). (A user first selects a template by using a keyboard and then the user submits changes again by using the keyboard). Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching system taught by Petersen and the system taught by Crutcher with the copying system disclosed by D'Arlach because it

would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely by providing access to the Internet

Claim 25:

Referring to claim 25, both Petersen and Crutcher are silent about the method of claim 18. However, D'Arlach teaches wherein copying information comprises employing a standard cut-and-paste buffer for an operating system of the first computing system. (See col. 5, lines 47-52). Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching system taught by Petersen and the system taught by Crutcher with the copying system disclosed by D'Arlach because it would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely by providing access to the Internet

Claim 26:

Petersen substantially teaches a memory buffer in conjunction with a switch-box. See Fig.1 and col. 5, lines 14-25, see also Fig. 4, storage control (412), retrieval control (438), buffer 3 (430.)) Petersen does not specifically teach a first computing system comprising a standard cut-and-copy buffer; associating the copied information with the associated user-id in the network cut-and-paste data-structure; determining by the control that a second dedicated predetermined event has been generated by the user at a second computing system; searching the network cut-and-paste data structure as a result of the second dedicated predetermined event, wherein the execution of the second dedicated predetermined event causes the information with the associated user-id to be copied from the network cut-and-paste data-structure to the second computing

system. However, Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 6-col. 8, line 65 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (a user input is interpreted as a first dedicated predetermined event. See Fig. 5(152); clipboard (110) is both the switch box and network cut-and-paste data-structure, which is external to the first computing system. See Fig. 4; as for the user-id see col. 7, lines 23-27: "the source port number" is interpreted as the user-id; as for the second predetermined event see col. 8, lines 35-43: "the user defines a group" is interpreted as the second predetermined event; as for the control recognizing the execution of the second dedicated predetermined event see col. 8, lines 50-65: "monitoring the UDP port" is interpreted as the control.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the switching system taught by Petersen with the method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors disclosed by Crutcher because such system would automatically share data among clipboards of multiple workstations, without the time consuming user operations. an Neither Petersen nor Crutcher specifically teaches an article comprising: a storage medium having a plurality of machine-readable instructions, wherein when the instructions are executed by a computing system, the instructions provide for

determining by a control in a switch-box that a first dedicated predetermined event has been generated by a user at a first computing system, wherein the user has an associated user-id and wherein the first computing system comprises a standard cut-and-copy buffer;

copying information from the first computing system to a network cut-and-paste data-structure and not to the standard cut-and-copy buffer of the first computing system as a result of the execution of the first dedicated predetermined event; and associating the copied information with the associated user-id in the network cut-and-paste data-structure. However, D'Arlach expressly discloses said limitations. (See col. 3, line 64 to col. 5, line 5.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching system taught by Petersen and the system disclosed by Crutcher with the copying system disclosed by D'Arlach because it would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely by providing access to the Internet.

Claim 28

Petersen substantially teaches the article of claim 26 as discussed above. Petersen is silent about wherein determining that the first dedicated predetermined event was generated comprises recognizing a first predetermined, time-limited event and determining that the first dedicated predetermined event was generated comprises recognizing a second predetermined time-limited event. Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 6-col. 8, line 65 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (a user input is interpreted as a first dedicated predetermined time-limited event. See Fig. 5 (152); as for the second predetermined event see col. 8, lines 35-43: "the user defines a group" is interpreted as the second predetermined time-limited event.) However, D'Arlach discloses said limitations. (See col. 3, line 64 to col. 5, line 5.) Hence, it would

have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching system taught by Petersen and the system disclosed by Crutcher with the copying system disclosed by D'Arlach because it would allow a user to perform editing functions remotely by providing access to the Internet.

Claim 29

Petersesn substantially teaches the article of claim 26 as discussed above. Petersen does not specifically teach "wherein the network cut-and-paste data structure comprises an array including a user-id data-field and an information-field". However,

Crutcher discloses a method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors enrolled therein. See Fig. 4 (110), col. 7, line 6-col. 8, line 65 and col. 10, lines 43-65. (clipboard (110) is both the switch box and network cut-and-paste data-structure, see also col. 7, lines 23-27)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the switching system taught by Petersen with the method and system for sharing data in a computer network having multiple processors disclosed by Crutcher because such system would automatically share data among clipboards of multiple workstations, without the time consuming user operations.

Claim 30

D'Arlach substantially teaches the article of claim 29 as discussed above. D'Arlach does not specifically teach "wherein associating the user-id with the copied information comprises copying the user-id to a user-id data field for a specific one array

entry and copying the information to a corresponding information data-field for the specific one array entry."

This claim is objected to for depending upon a rejected claim.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel Coffy whose telephone number is (571) 272-3997. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-3997. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Emmanuel Coffy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157

***
EC
March 2, 2006

ARIO ETIENNE
PRIMARY EXAMINER